

EXHIBIT 3
ENTIRE EXHIBIT
SUBMITTED UNDER SEAL

From: L a r r y P a g e <page@google.com>
To: David Lawee <dlawee@google.com>
Sent: Mon, 6 Dec 2010 16:21:37 -0800
Subject: Re: Chauffeur next phase

I'm not thinking of it as [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

-Larry

On Mon, Dec 6, 2010 at 2:56 PM, David Lawee <dlawee@google.com> wrote:

> perfect. That structure is my strong preference.

> I have folks meeting on it today as its been dragging and we need to get

> this over the goal line, get some certainty to the team, etc. I can find

> time to talk to you, and want to anyway, but just out of curiosity

> David

 \succ

> On Mon, Dec 6, 2010 at 2:20 PM, L a r r y P a g e <page@google.com> wrote:

>>

>> We should probably chat about this, but my thoughts off the cuff would be:

>>

>> something like

>>

>>

>> -Larry

>>

>>

≥ ≥

>> On Wed, Dec 1, 2010 at 9:52 PM, David Lawee <dlawee@google.com> wrote:

>> > We have talked internally about 2 different structures:

>>> [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

10/10/2014

██████████

11 of 11

>> > [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
>> > David
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > On Wed, Dec 1, 2010 at 6:30 PM, L a r r y P a g e <page@google.com>
>> > wrote:
>> >>
>> >> not sure what you mean by that....Anthony just needs some structure
>> >> where he can make a lot if this thing is really successful.
>> >>
>> >> He also wants to put in [REDACTED] so not sure how to deal with that.
>> >>
>> >> -Larry
>> >>
>> >>
>> >>
>> >> On Wed, Dec 1, 2010 at 4:39 PM, David Lawee <dlawee@google.com> wrote:
>> >> > Larry,
>> >> > I have thought about [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
> [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
>> >> > Does this make sense?
>> >> > David
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > ----- Forwarded message -----
>> >> > From: Sebastian Thrun <thrun@google.com>
>> >> > Date: Wed, Dec 1, 2010 at 4:17 PM
>> >> > Subject: Chauffeur next phase
>> >> > To: Neeraj Arora <narora@google.com>
>> >> > Cc: David Lawee <dlawee@google.com>
>> >> >
>> >> >
>> >> > Neeraj

>> >> >

>> >> > David asked me to loop you into the next phase for Project Chauffeur.

>> >> > We would like to [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

>> >> >

>> >> > Can we meet to talk about some of the details?

>> >> >

>> >> > Also, Larry learned that our own Anthony Levandowski (along with 2

>> >> > other co-founders) own a company called 510 Systems that might be of

>> >> > value to Chauffeur, in that is it developing laser sensors and

>> >> >

[REDACTED] that will be important to have in house. Larry would like

>> >> > us to do due diligence on a possible acquisition of this company.

>> >> >

>> >> > Finally, Larry asked us to do a general check on Anthony, and Anthony

>> >> > has supplied me with names we can call. Would you feel comfortable

>> >> > getting involved in this as well?

>> >> >

>> >> > Best

>> >> > Sebastian

>> >> >

>> >> >

>> >

>> >

>

>